

REMARKS

Applicant does not agree with the Examiner that the passage "... generating a general logic description of a service ..." does not have a clear meaning in view of the specification and/or drawings. The specification on page 12, line 17, to page 13, line 1, provides a detailed description of the picture editor and, from that description, it is clear what is the output of the picture editor (i.e., the logic description of a service) that goes to the code generator. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that the specification allows for an unambiguous interpretation of this term referred to by the Examiner.

The claimed invention is directed to a computerized device that preferably runs under the UNIX operating system (see page 1, first paragraph) for creating a service. The device includes a picture editor and a code generator. The service is created in a graphical environment (see page 1, lines 4-6). The runtime files that define the created service are executed on a Service Control Point in the telecommunications network, and this is made clear on page 13, lines 3-4. Claim 10 clearly identifies the structure and the function of the device, as well as the technical effect of the device, and is clearly directed to statutory subject matter.

As for the rejection on the merits, U.S. Patent No. 5,657,096 to Lukacs discloses a video conferencing system and a method in which a central multimedia bridge combines a plurality of multimedia signals into a single composite signal for each participant.

The Video Composing Modules (VCMs) 96-107 identified by the Examiner as equivalent to the applicant's "building blocks" are hardware components of the Video Composing Unit (VCU) 74, which in turn is part of the Video Bridge 32a. A user of the system disclosed by Lukacs can select an element of the GUI, but *not* the hardware VCM, and certainly there is *no* disclosure that the user can link the VCMs 96-107.

If the Examiner insists that the selection of an element of the GUI is equivalent to selection of the VCM and argues that the user can link the VCMs, then the applicant respectfully would like to point out that the hardware VCM as described by Lukacs is not a collection of broadband specific actions, data access and data manipulation routines, as clearly required by the main claim. The applicant would also like to direct the Examiner's attention to the fact that none of the Figs. 2, 4 or 7, or Abstract, or the accompanying description of Lukacs discloses that the VCM (building block according to the Examiner) is a collection as defined in the main claim.

Moreover, Fig. 9 and the accompanying description referred to by the Examiner in the same context, in the same paragraph of the Office Action of August 3, 2006, refers to software components, and not to the hardware VCM. It is Fig. 8 that shows components of the VCM and what is illustrated in Fig. 8 are other hardware components and, without any doubt, this is not the collection defined in the main claim.

Therefore, the applicant believes that new claim 10 is new and non-obvious and, in consequence, dependent claims 11 and 12 are also new and non-obvious.

Wherefore, a favorable action is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

KIRSCHSTEIN, OTTINGER, ISRAEL & SCHIFFMILLER, P.C.

Attorneys for Applicant(s)

489 Fifth Avenue

New York, New York 10017-6105

Tel: (212) 697-3750

Fax: (212) 949-1690



Alan Israel

Reg. No. 27,564